PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Го:		· ·		-	PCT
. •	see form F	PCT/ISA/220			TEN OPINION OF THE NAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT
			PAGENBERG LTENBURG GEISSLER • 81679 München	(PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)
์ โ	PCT II/AU?	221 Frist 07.0	10v. 2004 6. 05 wollsed 14. 05 wollsed 12	Date of mailing (day/month/year) s	ee form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
	nt's or agent's file rm PCT/ISA/22	reference	POL	FOR FURTHER See paragraph 2 be	
	ional application N P2004/005756		International filing date 27.05.2004	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 07.08.2003
nternati	ional Patent Class 67/307, C07C6	sification (IPC) or I 9/75, C07C51	both national classification /363, C07C61/15, C	on and IPC 07C251/44	
Applicar HONE	nt EYWELL SPEC	CIALTY CHEM	IICALS SEELZE GN	ивн	
				·	
: T	his opinion co	ntains indication	ons relating to the f	ollowing items:	
			·		
×	™ Box No. I	Basis of the op			
		Basis of the op			
×	Box No. II	Priority	noinion		tive step and industrial applicability
[<u>S</u>		Priority	ninion ment of opinion with re		tive step and industrial applicability
	Box No. II Box No. III	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity o	ninion ment of opinion with refinite the state of the st	egard to novelty, inven	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity o	ninion ment of opinion with refinite of invention tement under Rule 43 itations and explanation	egard to novelty, inven	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; ci Certain docum Certain defects	nent of opinion with refinition tement under Rule 43 itations and explanation tents cited s in the international a	egard to novelty, inven bis.1(a)(i) with regard ons supporting such st application	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; ci Certain docum Certain defects	nent of opinion with reference of invention tement under Rule 43 itations and explanations cited	egard to novelty, inven bis.1(a)(i) with regard ons supporting such st application	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; ci Certain docum Certain defect Certain observ	nent of opinion with refinition tement under Rule 43 itations and explanation tents cited s in the international a	egard to novelty, inven bis.1(a)(i) with regard ons supporting such st application	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
2. F	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTION	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain document Certain defects Certain observational preferences an Authoriteau under Rule	ment of opinion with refinition tement under Rule 43 itations and explanation ents cited in the international availance on the international all Preliminary Examination tell prelimination tell preliminat	egard to novelty, inventions. 1(a)(i) with regard one supporting such stapplication tional application is made, this opinion whing Authority ("IPEA") at the better the second control of the second c	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
2. F ttt	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI f a demand for i written opinion o he applicant cho nternational Bur will not be so coi	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; concertain documents of the International present of the International present under Rule and under Rule as provided above a written reputation of mailing	ment of opinion with refinity other than this one in the international available over, considered to be by together, where appropriation of the international available over, considered to be by together, where appropriation of the international areas and the international of the in	egard to novelty, inventions.1(a)(i) with regard one supporting such stapplication signal application is made, this opinion whing Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this International a written opinion of the openiate, with amending the opinion of the opinion opinion of the opinion opin	to novelty, inventive step or industrial catement vill usually be considered to be a 1. However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notifed the
2. F H v t t l l s r v	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI or a demand for invitten opinion on the applicant characteristic all Bur will not be so confirmed to the IPE months from the	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; circle Certain docum. Certain defects Certain observations. ON International preferences an Authorica under Rule insidered. as provided about a written repert a written repert date of mailing insidered.	ment of opinion with refinity invention tement under Rule 43 itations and explanations in the international avations on the international Preliminary Examination (all Prelimination (all Preliminatio	egard to novelty, inventions.1(a)(i) with regard one supporting such stapplication signal application is made, this opinion whing Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this International a written opinion of the openiate, with amending the opinion of the opinion opinion of the opinion opin	vill usually be considered to be a . However, this does not apply where ne chosen IPEA has notifed the national Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three
2. F H s r v	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI oritten opinion on the applicant che nternational Bur will not be so con f this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expire	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; circle Certain documents of Certain defects. Certain observations of the International preference and Authorical under Rule insidered. as provided above a written reperies and a written reperies later. Ins., see Form Priority of Total Control of Total Contr	ment of opinion with refinity of invention tement under Rule 43 itations and explanation ents cited in the international avations on the international Preliminary examination all Preliminary Examination to the internation of 66.1 bis(b) that writte ove, considered to be by together, where ap of Form PCT/ISA/220.	egard to novelty, inventions.1(a)(i) with regard one supporting such stapplication signal application is made, this opinion whing Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this International a written opinion of the openiate, with amending the opinion of the opinion opinion of the opinion opin	vill usually be considered to be a . However, this does not apply where ne chosen IPEA has notifed the national Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three
2. F H s r v	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI oritten opinion on the applicant che nternational Bur will not be so con f this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expire	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; circle Certain documents of Certain defects. Certain observations of the International preference and Authorical under Rule insidered. as provided above a written reperies and a written reperies later. Ins., see Form Priority of Total Control of Total Contr	ment of opinion with refinity invention tement under Rule 43 itations and explanations in the international avations on the international Preliminary Examination (all Prelimination (all Preliminatio	egard to novelty, inventions.1(a)(i) with regard one supporting such stapplication signal application is made, this opinion whing Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this International a written opinion of the openiate, with amending the opinion of the opinion opinion of the opinion opin	vill usually be considered to be a . However, this does not apply where ne chosen IPEA has notifed the national Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three
2. F H s r v	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI oritten opinion on the applicant che nternational Bur will not be so con f this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expire	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; circle Certain documents of Certain defects. Certain observations of the International preference and Authorical under Rule insidered. as provided above a written reperies and a written reperies later. Ins., see Form Priority of Total Control of Total Contr	ment of opinion with refinity of invention tement under Rule 43 itations and explanation ents cited in the international avations on the international Preliminary examination all Preliminary Examination to the internation of 66.1 bis(b) that writte ove, considered to be by together, where ap of Form PCT/ISA/220.	egard to novelty, inventions.1(a)(i) with regard one supporting such stapplication signal application is made, this opinion whing Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this International a written opinion of the openiate, with amending the opinion of the opinion opinion of the opinion opin	vill usually be considered to be a . However, this does not apply where ne chosen IPEA has notifed the national Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Seelmann, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8335



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/005756

IAP20 Rec'd POTIFIO 3 0 JAW 2006

	The state of the section of the sect							
	Box No. I Basis of the opinion							
1.	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.							
	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation full (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	ranslation from the origina urnished for the purposes	Il language into the following of international search					
2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid seque necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been	ence disclosed in the internation established on the basis	national application and of:					
	a. type of material:							
	☐ a sequence listing							
	☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing							
	b. format of material:	*						
	☐ in written format	, ·						
	☐ in computer readable form							
	c. time of filing/furnishing:							
	 contained in the international application as filed. 							
	☐ filed together with the international application in	computer readable form.						
	☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the pu	urposes of search.						
	In addition, in the case that more than one version of has been filed or furnished, the required statements copies is identical to that in the application as filed or appropriate, were furnished.	that the information in the	subsequent or additional					
4.	. Additional comments:							

	Box No. II Priority							-			
1.											
	☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(a)).										
	☐ translation of the ea	arlier appli	cation who	se priority	has beei	n claimed	d (Rule 43 <i>t</i>	pis.1 and 66.7	⁷ (b)).		
	Consequently it has not be nevertheless been establis	en possible shed on the	le to conside assumption	er the vali	dity of the relevant	e priority date is t	claim. This he claimed	s opinion has priority date	:		
2.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.										
3.	. Additional observations, if nece	essary:						•			
					•						
•	· ·						:				
	Box No. V Reasoned state industrial applicability; citation							entive step	or ·		
1	. Statement										
••		· · · -					•	:			
	Novelty (N)	Yes:	Claims	1-6							
		No:	Claims	7-10		,		. :			
	Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims	4-6		٠					
		No:	Claims	1-3		•					
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-10			. •	·			
								•			

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

10/566465

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/005756

Item V

IAPZORSO CITATITO 90 JAN 2006

The following document is referred to in this communication:

- D1 M. Tordeux et al., J. Fl. Chem., 70, 207-214 (1995) cited in the application
- D2 S. Rozen et al., J. Org. Chem., 56, 4695-4700 (1991)
- D3 C. G. Overberger et al., J. Polym. Science, Part A-1, 10, 2265-2289 (1972)
- D4 EP 0 905 109
- D5 WO 01 90 106
- D6 W. Schneider et al., Ber. 96(9), 2377-2386 (1963)
- D7 K. Kahr et al., Chem. Ber., 93, 132-136 (1960)
- D8 US 6 262 075
- D9 JP 2003 012 304
- D10 US 4 792 618

The present application relates to difluorocyclohexane-carboxylic ester of general formula (I') (claims 7-8), use thereof as intermediates in the manufacture of pharmaceutical products (claim 10) and preparation process thereof extended to any geminal difluoroalkanes (claims 1-6) as well as oximes of general formula (II') (claim 9).

V.1 Novelty - Art. 33(2) PCT

The subject-matters of claims 7 to 10 are not novel in view of the following disclosures:

D10: compound 3, table 1 and claim 6;

D9: compound 2, page 2 of the japanese patent with n = 1-10 provided in WPI-abstract;

D8: preparations 9(a) and 12, col. 33 and col. 35 respectively; in particular col. 33, lines 47-51 and col.35, lines 41-48;

D7; D6;

D5: examples 4-5, page 36;

D4: examples 11-12, page 25;

D3: compound XI, page 2268 and synthesis thereof on pages 2279-2280.

D2 pertains o the conversion of oxime to CF2 using IF (table I and description on pages 4698-4699). D1 describes the preparation of geminal dihaloalkanes in particular the difluoro-one compound 5a. Compound 5a is recovered therein from an unsubstituted

oxime (compound 1a) using anhydrous HF in ether in the presence of nitric oxide in 50% yield (pages 212-213: "using other oxidants"). The methyl-substituted difluorocyclohexane, compound 5d, is also indicated in this document (scheme 3).

None of the above-cited documents disclose the process of preparation of difluoroalkanes starting from an oxime in the presence of a nitrite and a complex based on hydrogen fluoride and an organic base. Novelty could be recognized for the process according to claims 1 to 6.

V.2 Inventive step - Art, 33(3) PCT

The closest related process is known from D1. It differs from the presently claimed one in the identity of the oxidant used: nitric oxide instead of a nitrite and the absence of an organic based/HF complex. The technical problem posed in the present application is to provide a process of preparation of geminal substituted difluoroalkanes applicable on an industrial scale, i.e. sufficient high yield and cost-effective reagents. The proposed solution is the process according to claim 1.

- 2.1 The present application has shown that such a process is solution of the present technical problem working under anhydrous conditions with HF/pyridine as fluorination agent, NaNO2 as oxidative agent on a carboxylic ester substituted oxime of formula (I') as substrate (examples 1-2). Since not all the essential technical features are present in claim 1, i.e. the anhydrous conditions and the particular substrate a cyclohexyl ring activated on the position 4 by a carboxylic group, no inventive step can be recognized for claims 1-3.
- 2.2 "Substituted" alkyl, aryl or aralkyl are the possibilities for the structural parameters R' and R". It comprises therefore the substitution by everything. In view of the experimental data provided it seems that ring constrain and activation on the para position are necessary for the initial substrate. Therefore the substitution of R and R' is specific. Accordingly only an inventive step could be recognized for the starting material of formula (I') (claims 4-6):

Geminal-Difluorocyclohexane, compound 5a in D1, is recovered from the corresponding unsubstituted oxime (compound 1a) using anhydrous HF in ether in the presence of nitric oxide in 50% yield (pages 212-213: "using other oxidants"). In

PCT/EP2004/005756

this document is the methyl-substituted difluorocyclohexane, compound 5d, also prepared starting from the 1-chloro-1-nitroso-equivalent, i.e. compound 2d (scheme 3; page 212). Preparation of geminal difluorides is possible only in the presence of a strong acid (D1, section 3., page 208, last two paragraphs- page 210, 1st paragraph). Therefore in view of the present disclosure the man skilled in the art would be inclined to pursue such a process on substituted oximes to recover the corresponding substituted geminal difluorides in presence of a strong acid. In the present application such a process according to D1 was performed modifying the oxidant to a nitrite (cf. comparative example 2). The recovered yield was of 7.6%, extremely low. The presence of a complex based on HF and pyridine allows to recover the gem-difluoro products in ca 60% yield (cf. examples 1 and 2). An inventive step could be therefore be recognized for the process according to claims 4-6

V.3 Further comments:

- 3.1 The organic base under claim 1 is preferably an amine. The choice of an ether as outlined on page 3 in the description is questionable. Clarification is accordingly kindly requested to the applicant. If the choice of an ether would remain then the relevance of D1 would be reconsidered for the question of inventive step in view of Et₂O used therein!?
- 3.2 The methods A and B have not been defined when referring to the two illustrative examples (pages 5-6).
- 3.3 Essential technical features are missing in claim 1 contravening to the requirements of article 6 PCT (for argumentation cf. inventive step).